DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 006 SP 010 160

TITLE What Valid and Feasible Criteria Can be Used to Hold Educational Systems Accountable?

PUB DATE 75

NOTE 105p.; Reprint of proceedings of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1st Spring Forum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, April 14-15, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Colleges; Conference Reports; *Educational Accountability; Measurement Techniques; *School Districts; *State Departments of Education; State School District Relationship; *Teacher Education; Validity

ABSTRACT

Reported are proceedings of a 1975 meeting of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges for Teacher Education at which educators questioned what valid and feasible criteria are available to test educational accountability. Four presentations are reprinted that focus on the following topics: accountability on the school district level; valid and feasible criteria that can measure the accountability of a teacher preparation program of a teacher education institution; valid and feasible criteria for judging the accountability of state departments of education in the areas of policy-making, decision-making, and implementation; and valid and feasible criteria for assessing the accountability for interaction between and recommendations from participants concerning the subjects of future discussions. (GW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126006

" WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ACCOUNTABLE ? "

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Proceedings of the

1st Spring Forum of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges for Teacher Education at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

April 14 & 15, 1975

Published by the
PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

SP 010 160

"WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ACCOUNTABLE?"

Proceedings of the
1st Spring Forum of the
Pennsylvania Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education at
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
April 14 & 15, 1975

Published by the
PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION 1974-75

President:	Dr. James E. Maurey Millersville State College
President-Elect:	Dr. Eugene Hammer Wilkes College
Treasurer:	Dr. John A. Stoops Lehigh University
Past Presidents:	Dr. N. L. Gamberoni Slippery Rock State College
	Dr. Paul Masoner University of Pittsburgh
Directors:	Dr. Larry Douglas Westminster College
	Dr. James F. Huston Edinboro State College
	Dr. Pearl J. Mullet Lehigh University
	Dr. James B. Macrae West Chester State College
	Dr. Norman Miller Beaver College
	Mr. Henry Q. Nichols Villanova University
	Dr. Henry M. Ryan Kutztown State College
	Dr. Jean A.Wilson Grove City College
Executive Secretary:	Dr. Fred Bryan PACTE Headquarters 800 North Third Street Harrisburg, Pa. 17102 Phone: (717) 232-8026

FOREWORD

The 1st Spring Forum devoted its program to an attempt to clarify criteria which could be used to hold educational systems accountable. There is general agreement that accountability implies responsibility for something. This notion assumes that the system which is accountable is a causal agent. But educational effects have multiple causes; hence, multiple agents are responsible or accountable for these effects, whether desirable or undesirable.

Within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the people have designated local school districts, institutions of higher education, and a department of education as those systems responsible for providing educational services. As a result of this forum, questions have been raised and responses made regarding accountability for the above systems, as well as for interaction between and among the systems. We intend for these questions and responses to be widely disseminated and used as further references for positive action.

PACTE is indebted to Dr. Fred Bryan, our Executive Secretary, and Mrs. Anne M. Kachel, my secretary, for the hours they worked to help make this forum a success.

James E. Maurey
President, PACTE
1974-1975

1975 Spring Forum Participants

Presentators:

Dr. Harry Faulk
Superintendent, Keystone Oaks School District

Dr. Horton Southworth
Division Chairperson
College of Education
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. John Stoops
Dean, School of Education
Lehigh University

Dr. J. William Moore
Chairperson, Department of Education
Bucknell University

Interaction Panel:

Dr. Jane Stockdale
Bureau of Teacher Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Dr. Lorraine Lee Morgan
Chairperson, Department of Education
Chatham College

Mr. Wesley Boots
Classroom Teacher
Southmoreland School District

CONTENTS

FOREWORD
James E. Maurey iii

ACCOUNTABILITY ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT LEVEL
Harry Faulk 1

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD A TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM?
Horton Southworth 22

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS ROLE IN POLICY MAKING, DECISION MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING?
John Stoops 39

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD THE TEACHING PROFESSION ACCOUNTABLE FOR INTERACTION BETWEEN AND AMONG THE VARIETY OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS
J. William Moore. 70

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING THE ISSUES EXPLORED BY THE FORUM 95

ACCOUNTABILITY ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT LEVEL

HARRY FAULK
Superintendent
Keystone Oaks School District

The topic that has been chosen for this forum is in the form of a question or a series of questions. The specific question that we will be dealing with for the next hour and a half is: What kind of valid, feasible criteria can be used in holding a school district accountable? No one feels that we will answer this question at this forum, nor will we answer the other questions that will be raised by the other presenters. The problems that we will be dealing with are too massive for us to solve in a 24 hour period. Our mission is to define the major problem and a series of related problems, and to develop a rationale for all of us to use in attacking the problem. If we can succeed in this mission, and have you leave here tomorrow with this rationale and a commitment to begin to deal with the problem, then our time together will have been well spent.

I'm going to try to develop two main points in my discussion: (1) the evils, dangers, and unfairness of current efforts in accountability, and (2) a list of valid, feasible criteria to which we can be held accountable for on the local school district level.

The second point is extremely difficult and my list will just be a start. It is my hope that the discussion which will result from this presentation will focus on reacting to items on my list and to extending the list to make it more comprehensive.

The term accountability applied to education means holding some people (teachers or administrators), some agency (Board of Education or State Department of Education), or some organization (professional organization or private company) responsible for performing according to agreed-upon terms. A very important part of the definition is, "for performing according to agreed-upon terms." This is where the accountability advocates insist on objective measurement and measurable objectives.

Almost every article in support of educational accountability has this statement in the first paragraph: "Victor Hugo noted that an idea whose time has come is not to be resisted. The time has come for accountability - educational accountability." Sometimes it is a shorter version, "an idea whose time has come." There is not doubt that educational accountability stands out as one of the most prominent thrusts in education today, and one of the fastest growing movements. The present educational accountability models were born in the late 1960's and today, according to the latest bulletin from Educational Research Service, February 1975, 32 states have legislation in

one or more of nine areas of accountability concepts. Nineteen of the states have state-wide assessment or evaluation of students, Pennsylvania is one of these.

The present models of accountability put all educators in a difficult position. To disagree or take exception is to become labeled as not wanting to be held responsible for the quality of your performance. No one wants this label. I am willing to be held accountable for the quality of education the students achieve under my direction. What I do question, though, are the criteria that are used and some of the thinking that permeates the process.

Leon Lessinger who is considered the leading proponent of accountability said in a speech in 1970, "Clearly, a new educational movement is under way." A little review of the history of American education will put this statement in its proper context. Accountability and scientific measurement which seems so new and full of promise to some educational reformers, has been tried before, and, it should be added, without the great success that was hoped for. In the early nineteen hundreds, attempts were made to measure and increase the efficiency within the schools. In his book, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Raymond Callahan reports that by 1915 there were special "efficiency bureaus" set up in major cities where "educational efficiency experts" worked full time

developing rating procedures to measure the teachers' performance, and to apply the principles of scientific management to public education. Then, as today, the ideas came from the areas of business and industrial management.

The principles and techniques that are being heralded as new are the same ones that dominated public education between 1900 and the Deparession, although the labels have been updates. Callahan summed up the consequences of applying business-industrial procedures and values to that period of education by noting, "that educational questions were subordinated to business considerations, that administrators were produced who were not, in any true sense educators; that a scientific label was put on some very unscientific and dubious methods and practices; and that an anti-intellectual climate already prevalent, was strengthened."

Additional historical perspective on this topic can be found in the accountability efforts in Ontario, Canada from 1876 to 1882. During that period, payments to high schools were largely dependent on the number of students who passed an intermediate examination after a year or two of attendance. This resulted in deliberate coaching for the examination, with concentration of teaching efforts upon the average and slightly below average students. The bright and the dull students were neglected, because the former could pass the examination without

any help and the latter couldn't pass it anyway. Although standards were raised according to the adopted criteria, this practice was abandoned in 1883 after a protest against the sacrifice of all other educational values for the attainment of this goal. Today one has cause to wonder if history is going to repeat itself.

Leon Lessinger and Dwight Allen in an article on "Performance Proposals for Educational Funding: A New Approach to Federal Resource Allocation" have this sentence. "But the fact that the many results of education are subjective and not subject to audit should not deter us from dealing precisely with those aspects of education that lend themselves to precise definition and assessment. Rather it demands that we do make maximum use of these individual parts that tell us what the change in the whole has been." This statement is a very dangerous one and this thinking is at the root of much of what is wrong in the current way of accountability. All of us know that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, so it surely must be much more than the sum of a few parts.

Now for the words about dealing with "those parts that lend themselves to precise definition." There is a principle of psychology that goes as follows: If there is a discrepancy between the real objectives and the tests used to measure

achievement, the latter become the main influence upon choice of subject matter and method. This means to me that if we concentrate on measurable learnings, these become the program, and I shudder at the thought because we all know that the dimension of behavior which is most susceptible to quantificaion is of least importance.

The advocates of accountability have committed themselves to a quantitative system of measurement. There is some usefulness in knowing the rate at which a person can perform a skill. But I am not certain that we can measure objectively and quantitatively what a person learns in the social sciences and the humanities unless they are rendered lifeless by being reduced to names, dates, and places. Educational measurement in our present accountability models encourages teachers to offer a simplistic view of life, conditions students to look for the right and wrong answer without doing the necessary and hard work of thinking and wrestling with ambiguities, and allows the educator to maintain the illusion that he is conducting his enterprise on a scientific basis.

Each time I see the efforts of persons to measure the immeasurable, I'm reminded of the expression of one of them, "Good Lord! The thing was a mystery and we measured it."

Accountability today is industrial consciousness applied to non-industrial problems. With all its dangers

and evils, one has to wonder why so many educators have jumped on the bandwagon and support the concept so strongly. Bundy in the Phi Delta Kappan wrote, "It is rapidly becoming the articulated response of professional elites who fear public recrimination and must at all costs protect their position and power." I think this is part of the answer. Another part of the answer can be found in school administrators who see accountability as a means of bringing teachers to heel. Not having been able to provide direction through acceptable leadership practices and having been stripped of their paternalistic and autocratic power through negotiations, some school administrators see accountability as the magic elixir that will make everything right again.

No accountability model of any value can hold any segment of an organization solely responsible for the accomplishments or failures of the total organization. So teachers cannot be held solely responsible. In the case of a local school district, accountability has to be shouldered by all involved groups: state legislators, department of education, board of school directors, electorate of the school district, school administrators, teacher training institutions, and the teaching staff. All of these groups determine what happens in the schools, so all must be subject to an accounting.

As we look at accountability on the local school district

level, it needs to be pointed out that, as much as possible, the accountability should be on the local school in the school district. We realize that the local school does not have control over all facets of its operation, so, needless to say, it should not be held accountable for what it doesn't control. However, the local school should have autonomy to the greatest degree possible, and it should be held accountable for the areas in which it has control. On the other hand, the school district should be held accountable for the other facets of the program, those that it controls.

VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA

A local school district should be held accountable for:

1. Attracting and keeping the best educated, highest certificated, and experienced teachers on the faculty.

   There is ample research evidence to show that teachers are the most important variable in a school. Significant correlations exist between each of the criteria listed above and the achievement of students. This criterion is extremely significant at this time when many school boards are limiting their employment to local residents.

2. Assigning each teacher a reasonable teaching load.

   Kuhus, using measures of quality derived from the Pennsylvania Quality Education Project found that teacher effectiveness in producing learning was related to lower teaching loads in terms of teaching hours per week, but unrelated to class size.

3. Having available an adequate amount and quality of

instructional materials and supplies for use by teachers and students.

Studies by Fox, Flanagan, and Kiesling indicate a relationship between student achievement and the amount and quality of instructional materials and supplies.

4. Operating an educational program in which students develop an interest in school and in learning.

The Pennsylvania Quality Assessment results show positive correlations between interests in school and learning and these goals: Human Accomplishments, Changing World, Health Habits, Citizenship, Understanding Others, and Self-Understanding.

5. Operating the local school district in a manner that gives each individual school a great deal of autonomy.

The typical school district has a population that is diverse, with each school, especially on the elementary school level, having a more homogeneous population than the district at large. Therefore, schools should have the opportunity to develop programs best suited for the type of community it serves.

6. Each school should have an organized method for identifying problems and seeking their solution.

The school should maintain written records showing that school personnel working with lay people from the community identify problems that exist and develop programs to resolve these problems. This will show that the school is dynamic, improving, and involving the people of the community in a meaningful way.

7. Providing a program for identifying students who are atypical and an educational program to deal with these students.

Unless this is done the atypical student suffers and the other students in the classroom also suffer.

8. Having materials, books, and other instructional materials

that are multi-cultural and show women in all roles rather than the stereotypes.

Such materials are essential to the achievement of a school's goal of having students understand themselves and others.

9. Identifying students who are not achieving at their ability level in the basic skills and providing programs to give these students special help.

It is commonly accepted that this is the basic mission of the school so we should make every effort possible to carry out this mission.

10. Making it possible for students to have free and easy access to a learning resource center.

Learning how to learn is necessary for a student to be able to pursue learning and this can be best practiced in a learning resource center. Also, a student needs to learn that no single source contains all that one needs to have access to in the world today.

11. Making it possible for students to have easy access to a guidance counselor.

The studies on counseling services show that the ratio of students to counselors is not as significant as is the accessibility of a counselor to a student. This does not seem to relate to the ratio of students to counselors, but seems to be a function of how the counselor operates.

12. Seeing that students who do not plan some type of post high school education graduate from high school with a salable skill.

This will increase the relevance of education and achieve one of the goals of education found on every list of educational goals.

13. Carrying on a continuous in-service program geared to the identified needs of teachers and problems of the school and/or school district.

This will make in-service education a relevant experience for teachers and should improve the school.

14. Providing an action learning experience during the senior year of high school.

    Every major recent study of secondary education cites the need for schools to do more to ease the transition from the world of the school to the real world. Action learning experiences, where students spend time out in the community, are the best known method of doing this. Action learning also can help the school make the senior year a more meaningful experience for students. A recent study of the National Association of Secondary School Principals reports that nearly 70 per cent of the principals contacted believe that there is a problem, "a lack of motivation and a mixture of apathy and restlessness among many of their 12th grade students."

15. Conducting a periodic self evaluation of the school program followed up by a visiting committee.

    The results of this evaluation should be made known to the community along with the school's plans to deal with the weaknesses revealed in the evaluation.

16. Using teaching methods which are congruent with modern psychology of teaching and learning.

    This includes methods which enhance a student's self concept, and methods which teach him that the most critical problems are not answered by responses which are right or wrong, as our typical examinations tend to teach.

17. Periodically using an instrument to assess the climate of the school. The School Climate Profile of the Kettering foundation published by Phi Delta Kappa is a good example of such a profile. The use of this profile calls for it to be completed by school personnel, students, and parents.

    The use of an instrument to chart school climate enables all concerned to constantly monitor the climate that prevails in the school. A positive school climate is both a means and an end. A good climate makes it possible to work productively toward goals such as academic learning, social development, and curriculum improvement. It also

makes school a good place to be, a satisfying and meaningful situation in which both adults and youth care to spend a substantial portion of their time.

CONCLUSION

Accountability is generally associated with deciding on goals, planning for their achievement, and designing methods of evaluation which determine whether the goals have been realized. Evaluation of products is an integral part of any accountability program. However, a preoccupation with the achievement of immediate goals can result in an impoverished environment for children and teachers. For example, it is possible to put enough pressure on teachers and students to increase productivity as measured by standardized test scores. However, such pressure may set in motion a self defeating chain of events: teachers begin to teach for the tests, teachers and students recognize that such education is neither relevant nor interesting, and the morale of teachers and students drops. The net effect is that the quality of educational experiences is lowered. So, achieving the short-term goal of better test results may actually hinder the achievement of long-range goals of schools.

In considering the industrial model of input-output relationships there is one important factor that one cannot ignore. In business and industry the quality of the input

12

can be controlled. In education, the most important input is the student. There is wide agreement among the researchers that variables outside the school impinge upon learning more powerfully than the variables within the school. These out-of-school forces, over which the school has little influence, include: parents' desires for the education of their children, educational level of the parents, structural integrity of the family, family income, the students' self-concept, social composition of the student body, and trust and confidence in the social environment. Since the schools operate with varying inputs, it is virtually impossible to use input-output relationships to demonstrate the productivity of a school.

Unfortunately, we find ourselves in an era when people are disenchanted with their social institutions. The schools, being close and common to many people, are the prime targets of the social critics. This is not necessarily bad. What is important is how those of us in leadership react to the critics.

The story is told of an aboriginal tribe which believed that the worst thing that could happen to a man was that his spirit should escape from his body. So, when a man got sick people began to worry that his spirit might escape and, if local medicines and the witch doctor's charms did not prove enough, the family would gather about the patient and stuff all of his body openings with a mixture of grass, leaves and

mud to keep his spirit from leaving his body. Under this treatment, of course, the patient always died - but everyone felt better for having done something about it. Many a wrong in human history has been carried out by men of good intentions without proper perspective.

Most accountability models represent a closed system, ends are set up in advance. This places a straitjacket on teachers and students alike and makes the learning situation a search for "right" answers.

The model that is proposed in this paper focuses on process so most of the criteria deal with the process and not the product.

My plea is not that we refuse to hold ourselves accountable, but that we resist efforts of accountability that tend to create school experiences that will make people less, at a time when our great need is for people who are all that they can become.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Do you feel the evils and dangers expressed by the writer are real? Would you add other concerns that you feel?

2. What is your reaction to the criteria suggested by the writer? Would you add to the list or would you eliminate any of the criteria?

3. Should we as persons with a vested interest try to determine the criteria for which we should be held accountable or should this be the function of a more objective, detached group?

4. What do you feel is causing the great push toward accountability and how do you feel we should react to it?

Q. How does one defend the decision to examine process rather than the product? Who should make such a decision?

R. (Dr. Paulk) The reason I think we need to go to the process rather than the product is that I believe that when we start to concentrate on the product we tend to make education less than what it ought to be. Because we tend to deal with measurement, and those things we can measure are not the important things in education. I think that it is the idea of product that leads us down the path of behavioral objecives, and I think that if we carry that too far, that becomes deadly. It is the idea of making education more and opening up the world that leads me to process rather than product. Now as to who should make the decision whether we go in that direction or not is beyond my capability to answer. Right now we have E.Q.A. (Educational Quality Assessment) in Pennsylvania, and this, to me, deals mostly with product. Right now most of the literature we read deals with product. Therefore, the emphasis is on product rather than process. I am a voice in the wilderness in saying that we ought to be moving more into process, because if we have the right process we will produce the right product.

R. (Dr. Stoops) I can try to respond by saying too, in terms of product and process, these are not good ways to think about education in the first place. I think that when you get

into that mode of logic, you've gotten away from some of the important considerations one has to entertain before you've settled the question of evaluation. The thing to remember, if you want to talk about the outcomes of any educational practice, is that the school is only one player on the team. There is the family, there is a host of enterprises as well as the media, and a great many other things, such as peer groups. So how, when you look at measured outcomes, are you able to ascertain which of those outcomes come as a consequence of operations within the school, and therefore, for which the school ought to be held accountable. Thinking of education in terms of products, and the school as a producer of products is a mistake.

R. (Dr. Moore) I'm going to be a bit different in my responses. I have to ask a question. Why are we concerned with measurement? I suppose one answer is to assure society that the school is accomplishing what it is supposed to accomplish. I submit to you that we in the profession, teachers and professional educators, do not have to worry about that too much, in terms of being held accountable. There is historical evidence which indicates schools are held accountable. The old Latin Grammar School disappeared because society withdrew its support. It was replaced by the Academy, which was developed on the same principle as the Latin Grammar

School, and, as its objectives changed and became more like the Latin Grammar School, society again withdrew its support. The Academy was also replaced, etc. . I won't go on retracing this history. The fact is society does hold institutions accountable in terms of its products. But I think we are answering the questions the wrong way as professionals. What do we mean by accountability in terms of a local school district? Are we doing what we as a profession can do in a school district? What is the evidence that we are accomplishing this? I heard people in one group discussing whether we should of had parents as participants in this forum. My response would be-to what end? To establish objectives for the schools? To determine accountability procedures? These things should not be done by professional educators. If it is to establish evidence that the profession is accomplishing that which it is charged to accomplish, that is a different matter and this needs to be answered by professionals. To summarize that point, to me the whole purpose of accountability for the profession is to gleen some evidence, crude as it may be, that we are accomplishing what we set out to accomplish as individual educators. Not to grade the students, not to affect the objectives, that is the responsibility of society. Even though the test may be crude, if it is valid, and I've decided that is what I'm going to teach for, I want to have some evidence

that I am capable as a teacher and effecting change.

R: (Dr. Southworth) I'd like to respond in two ways. Taking Harry Faulk's fourth point, "Operating an educational program in which students develop an interest in school and learning," wherein he cites the Educational Quality Assessment program, several of my colleagues at the University of Pittsburgh are trying to lead the faculty down the path of drawing a relationship between what we are preparing in terms of the next group of teacher candidates, and the achievement of quality assessment in the several school districts. I contend that we already have a number of sets of criteria we are responsible to, and to add Basic Education's criteria on top of these would make it mechanically impossible to actually show the relationship between teacher preparation and student achievement. In terms of implementation, we are in a very primitive state. On the other hand, the Superintendent of Schools in Pittsburgh is raising the question as to what results can be shown from having clustered ten student teachers and ten interns in X number of buildings for the past five years. What has happened in terms of achievement, attitude toward schools, attendance rates, and decreasing teacher turnover? We are getting pressure from both teacher educators and basic educators to show that relationship between the preparation of a teacher candidate or a group of educational personnel and actual achievement of the pupils they

are working with. This is difficult, and I am not sure how we are going to handle it at this point. I think in the long run, we are going to address ourselves to the linkage between what it is that we are saying we are doing in higher education and the product in society.

Q. To what degree should the student be held responsible for school's success?

R. (Dr. Faulk) I think part of the problem in the past is that we have held the student too responsible, particularly if he didn't do well, we say it is his fault. If he did well however, we took the credit and were not honest enough to admit that we had little to do with it. So, I'm reluctant to hold the student responsible. I'm more inclined to hold the school responsible and also the parent responsible. After all, the attitudes that the student brings to school comes out of the home. Therefore, I wouldn't hold the student responsible, except, of course, for his own behavior.

Q. What does "a school's success mean?"

R. (Dr. Faulk) To me it means how well the school meets the criteria I've outlined in my presentation.

Q. Who determines the criteria and whether they are valid and feasible?

R. (Dr. Faulk) If I were to go into a school district and talk about holding the school accountable, I would have the

teachers, the school board, and people from the community to work together to develop the criteria by which we would evaluate the schools. I would hold this group accountable for the validity and feasibility of the criteria. The superintendent should provide the leadership to see that criteria are developed. This group should also have the responsibility for arranging the criteria and goals into some priority listing. Because of vested interests, it is difficult to arrange criteria and goals into a workable priority listing.

Q. Are there any general criteria which you feel are important to all school districts?

R. (Dr. Faulk) The criteria that I have suggested I think would be common for all school districts. These have application across the board, and if I had to make judgements on a school or school district, I would feel comfortable with these criteria.

Q. So we could have 17 criteria for school systems in addition to the Ten Goals of Quality Education?

R. (Dr. Faulk) Well, I think these are more meaningful than the Ten Goals. I feel that if you have these kinds of criteria you could accomplish what is outlined in the Ten Goals. I think we can be held accountable for these, but I doubt if we can be held accountable for the Ten Goals. Some of the Ten Goals, e.g. "citizenship," is more of a goal for the home and

community than for the school.

Q. To whom is the local district accountable?

R. (Dr. Faulk) This is one of the present problems. We are accountable to the Pennsylvania Department of Education in terms of the Ten Goals of Quality Education. We give the tests and then publish the results. Somebody then comes forth and questions the results on one of the items such as "understanding others." They insist that they don't see this as a responsibility of the school, they will take care of this in the home. I think the measures of accountability, to some extent, have to be related to the local level. I realize that this is a problem, because "understanding others" is a legitimate goal in education.

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD A TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM?

HORTON SOUTHWORTH
Division Chairperson
University of Pittsburgh

Accountability can be an acceptable concept attached to any purposeful endeavor if the givens are clearly identifiable at the onset of program design and into implementation. It is a reasonable request of the professional institution, organization, and the governmental agency if accountability is administered multi-dimensionally. It would be a serious issue if accountability criteria were only applied to a single dimension of a profession.

It is timely and appropriate that this professional forum has been convened to examine some aspects and the interrelationships between four components of the profession and their responsibility for generating valid and feasible criteria against which accountability can be assessed.

It would be simplistic in nature to take a position that we are only beholden to the pursuit of truth and rational processes with our students. That to equip teacher candidates with the knowledge and ability to cope with role, institutional purpose, and the changing needs of society would suffice to

meet our institutional obligations. The Commonwealth into the third Century has greatly complicated our task by mandating several categories of criteria against which teacher educators must reconcile their endeavors. Let's set two categories before you so that we can recognize the complexity of the impending forum.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education, with the support and in cooperation with higher education institutions, has evolved a Program Approval Process whereby the faculties of the several institutions state their program purposes, processes and assessment procedures according to twenty-two state standards or guidelines of accountability. We have all agreed to visitations at least each five years in order to examine our accountability to each other and the twenty-two standards.

Some institutions also submit to NCATE, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. This obligates the institution to review each ten years according to a set of national standards and guidelines of accountability.

Occasionally, a state or states will explore and implement more specific accountability factors such as the sixty-six, now twenty-two, Competency Based Teacher Education guidelines currently being experienced in Pennsylvania.

The Interstate Compact, I understand, has now put forth another set of standards which eventually may replace in priority

both PDE and NCATE standards.

Middle School Accreditation in a more basic manner also influences or shapes the institutions which may have teacher education programs; therefore, we must recognize all these standards as potential or real measures of accountability.

As an example, let's examine Standard IV in the Pennsylvania General Standards

> The institution shall provide evidence of program evaluation procedures which are designed to encourage dynamic and continuously improving programs for the preparation of professional school personnel.

One kind of reply which may have been found generally adequate by visiting teams was as follows:[1]

At present and in the recent past the programs of teacher education--like all the University's programs--have been under very sharply focused evaluation by the leaders of various reform movements. Each of these reforms, occasionally initiated by public outcries and punctuated by crises, generates its own best sellers: Why Johnny Can't Read, Quackery in the Public Schools, How Children Fail, Crisis in the Classroom, and Death at an Early Age. If we add to such perennial incentives to improvement the contemporary crescendo of students' demands

[1]School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Programs for Initial Certification of Teachers, 1972, Volume 1, pp 6 & 7.

for more and more of a voice in their own education, coupled with professors' demands for innovation, it becomes clear why the School of Education has not been starved for encouragement to evaluate and improve its programs.

Informal evaluation processes may be treated in departmental reports. In addition, the School of Education maintains contact with the graduates of its programs by way of the activities of alumni associations and informal consultation with former students. In recent years, the student bodies have become both active and helpful in the evaluation of the School's programs of teacher education. Students now have representation on almost all School of Education Committees, and they communicate their ideas and opinions through these channels as well as through individual and group representations to administration and faculty. Formal evaluations are carried on administratively within the School of Education as well as by NCATE and regional accreditation agencies.

However, I find its general nature inadequate without additional specific statements of rationale, extent, case documentation and implications of program evaluation, program-by-program, over a period of implementation. I believe through specificity that we may succeed with accountable criteria.

Another example found in The Generic 22[2] is:

> R1 The teacher will analyze educational issues and theories.

The institutional program accountability is really unfocused and would necessitate faculty/student identification of typical or relevant issues and theories to be subjected for analysis. It seems to provide the profession ample maneuvering room in which to "do one's thing", "be humane", "guarantee academic freedom" and individual rights, etc.

As professionals we will have to move toward increased specificity by listing examples of the theories and issues analyzed and some typical student/faculty perspectives resulting from the process. Further, it would seem feasible to test a teacher candidate's capability to analyze in the situational context with children, youth, other teachers and parents. I wonder how many of us are consistently practicing such alternatives or extensions to this specificity beyond the campus environment?

Mission statements are currently in vogue which demand that Deans, Chairpersons, faculty and staff develop clear statements

---

[2]PACBTE Handbook, A Resource for Developing Competency Based Teacher Education Programs, 1974, p. 9, Bureau of Academic Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

of mission, goals and objectives. We must identify needs, priorities and philosophic assumptions that govern or support this process. The refinement of these documents often involve countless hours of faculty deliberation, including semantic arguments, hierarchial debates with all the accompanying animosities. Being accountable within one's institution is an increasing expectation for all of us in higher education.

These required statements of intent are reasonable expectations if they clarify program purpose for students, strengthen professional rationales for faculty, and assist administrators in the decision processes affecting personnel and institutional resources.

Graduate and professional in-service standards must meet the expectations set within the institution. Frequently, the philosophy and nature of the college or university dictate special requirements to satisfy faculty beliefs about graduate study. For example, the expectation of scholarly library or controlled laboratory research would not necessarily be an accountability criteria given high priority by the other components of the profession. In the long run, that extra experience may be an important factor serving the profession in the Commonwealth.

Cost effectiveness is another increasing institutional pressure which requires that we document unit costs. It is

repulsive for many of us to have to cost out teaching which we may consider an art form. However, the absence of unit cost data has perhaps weakened our building a profession historically. Our case for adequately financing the preparation of teachers has been poorly stated at many institutions. We succumbed to mass producing classroom teachers in order to sincerely confront a societal need. Other professions through political or economic maneuvering have carefully orchestrated standards and financial resources with minimal requests for accountability until this decade. The cost question will not disappear; therefore, as teacher educators, we must develop the competencies to effectively meet the challenges from within and without.

Faculty effectiveness as a criteria for institutional accountability is as difficult a challenge in higher education as in basic education. The students, peer faculty and administration all have a responsibility to document their assessment of effective instruction.

The comparison across content fields is difficult, the size of college classes, the level of study, the factor of experience, the ratings in several courses, the nature of assignment, the trends over time for an individual faculty member all must be considered.

The broad categories of teaching, research and service

require increased specificity of criteria in order to implement the typical institutional promotion and tenure guidelines. The trend toward open records, open process require each of us to develop professional maturity in participating in judgments about colleagues. It increases the risk of legal challenge to internal professional accountability processes. Both the candidate, his or her mentors and the institutional policies must be explicit and ethically administered. Each component of the profession must develop and monitor responsible personnel assessment.

One other important expectation for higher education is to provide society with a research capability. In our case, research to document support for or rejection of teacher education practices. How are we to judge the adequacy, the focus, the results of institutional research? The teacher education component of the profession certainly needs to be held accountable for this function. The criteria and specificity again seems to be lacking. Research priorities need to be examined at each of our institutions granted approval for programs preparing educational personnel. Perhaps we need to place some priorities on research in teacher education in the Commonwealth.

In summary, these are two brief sets of criteria, one external, the other internal. They should provide sufficient items to help initiate this forum. I would be quick to admit that

additional valid and feasible criteria could be identified.

Q. What, realistically, is the strength or status of organized external evaluators, P.D.E., N.C.A.T.E., etc.?

R. (Dr. Southworth) I'm assuming that through P.D.E., N.C.A.T.E., Middle States, that the whole conceptual process of external visitors, either confirming or dialoguing around self-study, that there is enough honor within the profession that none of us who serve on a visitation team is going to permit practices to go on that we wouldn't want to happen to our own children. It's been my experience, having gone through two NCATE and three PDE evaluations, that outside visitors usually confirm some of the weaknesses you've already discovered, and they may give you political license to argue with your own administration to make changes. I'm not so sure though, in some cases, where we really have a limitation of time, two or three days, for a group of people to come in and take a comprehensive look, whether the process is realistic, in terms of the complexities of a real study. I would really raise the question as to whether the present process is adequate, and I'm reflecting more on N.C.A.T.E. at this point. I think the evaluating vehicle has to be looked at. I think it is being played honestly by those of us who are on each other's visitation teams. I just have to believe that people who have visited us have helped very candidly to identify the very things that I think ought to be

identified.

Q. Are you implying that teacher educators must become active politically?

R. (Dr. Southworth) Yes, I'm implying that the whole profession needs to become politically skillful and that we need to look at the representation of any legislative body in terms of whether it accurately represents the kinds of beliefs and values that this profession holds. We can't call Harrisburg and command a significant lobby like the field of medicine, law, business, or engineering. At this point, I feel that we are very naive, about how to use such power. I'm not sure that we can put all of our eggs in the teacher organization basket and feel that because we have 100,000 members that we will win all the battles for the profession. It seems to me that all of us, depending on our assignment in the profession, need to become much more active politically.

Q. Can we apply hard science criteria to teacher education programs?

R. (Dr. Southworth) I've quoted from Gene Glass in Educational Research, March, 1975, and he begs the issue and points out that you can either feel good about it and not measure it, or you better buy into it and assess progress, and move on it. So, I guess I'm one who believes that if you want to be called a profession, you must define objectives and

identify the alternatives for reaching them, and figure out some way of assessing them imaginatively. I think it can be done. If you can't do that, then I'm not so sure we can be called a profession. If you think teaching is an art, a performance kind of thing, and can't be tampered with, I think that's turning our backs on the issue. I think we have to determine the most humane and rational way of declaring what we are about, and identify ways of reaching and assessing our objectives.

Q. Dr. Faulk, this morning, made the comment that "the dimension of behavior which is most susceptible to quantification is of least importance." Would you disagree with that point?

R. (Dr. Southworth) I think I would disagree with the general statement. I'm not sure that everything is measurable, and I'm not sure that I buy into the reductionist wave that's going across with everything having to be stated behaviorally. I think a great deal of what we do, and what we call teaching, research, service, or advising, can be documented both by the users of that service and the recipients of that service, as well as those that claim implementation responsibilities. There are some faculty members who would say, as I mentioned in my remarks, that students have no valid perception, because they haven't had to implement the tools, or principles, or

values, and therefore, can only give you a response in a very narrow time frame. I can't take that position.

Q. How can we maintain standards in light of open admissions today?

R. (Dr. Southworth) The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education said that we have to responsibly maintain access for any segment of our society. You have to square that with the plateau of the economy; you have to square that with where society is, and it is constricting at this point. Society has lost confidence in itself, and it may take another year or two before we regain confidence and begin growing, building, repopulating, and refining institutions. On the one hand, you have the Ryan Act example in a state that says "change the formula and reduce enrollments, we are going to reduce funding to higher education". On the other hand, you have the society that is questing for advanced education and they ought to have the right of choice as to whether they want to become teachers, pharmacists, lawyers, engineers, or business people. I don't know whether we have the right, or any element of the profession has the right to deny them of that opportunity.

Q. Are there ways of making more accurate predictions regarding a student's teaching success?

R. (Dr. Southworth) Several researchers have looked at characteristics that make a good teacher. I guess that when

you're working in the area of human behavior, as in the case of physicians right now and their malpractice insurance, they are coming to realize that they are practicing on human bodies, and without the strength and the investment in pharmacology and in hospitals and technology, they might of not made as many good guesses in the past. But now if they are the key decision makers weaving chemicals, drugs, and technology of the hospital together, and they are the one who makes the decision, we are now holding them accountable. Therefore, their insurance rates are going up and people are suing them. We are in an endeavor that is probably just as intangible. Some things can be measured, and some things you can't predict as accurately. I suspect if we could stamp them out or go to the test tube, or whatever way you would produce the teachers of tomorrow, it would look like 1984. I'm not sure that we aren't going to have to live with some variables that we cannot control. I .. don't know of anybody that has a handle on the admissions process and foolproof criteria. I know a number of institutions that have gained stature and success because they have made better selections of the kind of candidates they have worked with. But when you've got open admissions and try to address the needs of society, you just increase the variables.

Q. Can you prepare a teacher and turn them loose on pupils in four years? Should we examine the whole question,

and wouldn't now be a beautiful time to do so?

R. (Dr. Moore) That is the battle cry of many people, as well as mine for many years. Having sat on the Teacher Education Advisory Committee for many years, there was much to do about making sure that we had certified teachers in our schools. Not necessarily qualified, but certified, and now that we have the opportunity to address effectiveness in teaching we hear the question of how are we to reduce the number going into teaching. If it takes four years beyond the bachelor's degree to train a person to become an effective clinical psychologist, and if in teaching we find ourselves faced with so many complex problems, then why should we expect that we ought to be able to prepare an effective teacher within the bachelor's degree. Until we really address ourselves to the question of what it takes to prepare an effective teacher, which may mean six to seven years of comprehensive in-service training, I think that we are going to turn out people that are inadequately trained, and people will continue to conclude that teacher education does not make a difference. Rather, our problem is that we do not have time to do what we know how to do reasonably well.

Q. As in the case of the medical model, should we wait until after the first year on the job and then qualify teachers?

R. (Dr. Moore) I just don't want us to find ourselves

trying to do the impossible and then claiming that what we have done is a finished product. That is our problem.

Q. If we extend the preparation period for teachers, would the public be willing to pay the price?

R. (Dr. Faulk) The value of that would have to be demonstrated. In other words, if you simply state that you would do this or that if the public would pay for it, I think there would be great reluctance. But, if we could get models of the right kinds of teachers into the classroom, and show that they make a difference, what has been suggested could come about.

R. (Dr. Moore) I think that we are going to change the model of what we call "teaching in the schools." It may mean, as Harry Broudy notes, that if we have 150 professionals in the schools, that only 50 of these might be considered teachers with the kind of competence I've suggested. The other professionals would have training more like we now give at the bachelor's level. To that extent you might be able to keep the budget somewhere near the same, but pay $20,000 a year for those 50 professionals.

Q. What is an effective teacher? How many of us know whether or not we are training effective teachers?

R. (Dr. Moore) I think the evidence we have in our own program does indicate that we are making some differences. That is, our training does produce a difference in terms of student performance. Whether other people are getting any

differences or not, I don't know. I am not suggesting that our training is sufficient and the differences we are getting are the differences we would like.

Q. Should a teacher education institution be held accountable for assessing the effectiveness of its product?

R. (Dr. Moore) My answer is *no!* I think that should be the responsibility of educational researchers, and the teacher training programs ought to be held accountable for showing a logical relationship between their program and the demonstrated competencies that educational researchers have shown to exist. It is asking too much of each teacher education program to demonstrate empirically that this relationship occurs.

Q. What is the difference between a science and a critique?

R. (Dr. Stoops) We've been talking about education as being a science. Science offers a knowledge system that is built pretty much like a brick wall, or at least is arranged structurally. Art, on the other hand, might be compared to a fountain of water with colored balls that play on top in almost endless variations. I was reminded of that when I heard the presentation this morning which I thought brought back the notion that what we are seeing in this accountability movement is the repeat of an almost endless theme; just variations on the same theme. They keep repeating themselves century after century. This is the way of art, and when you have an art you

don't develop your academic tradition as you would a science, but as you would a critique. And so it seems to me that we need to present the question, when we come to the issue of teacher education, or more broadly, the study of education, whether it is a science or whether it is a critique.

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS ROLE IN POLICY MAKING, DECISION MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING?

JOHN SCOOPS
Dean, School of Education
Lehigh University

A concern for the place of government in human affairs is always timely, but it is especially so as the Watergate twilight darkens before the anticipated sunrise of our national bicentennial. It is already evident that as Americans prepare to enter a third century of government constituted through the public will that a re-examination of the social contract which binds us as a people is much in our thoughts. And it is within this social contract that we must find criteria by which any of our institutions of state or national government are to be held accountable. Our history shows the accountability process is always deliberative, occasionally vituperative, and often perplexing. But criteria are present and their validity and feasibility have been demonstrated many times.

Self evidently we are a people who believe in the maximization of personal freedom. Admirable as they were and revered as they are, the ideology implanted by the early settlers in Massachusetts is not American. The principles of our social contract are not established in colonial New England. Although

we in education are fond of quoting their "Deluder Satan" laws, especially as a precedent for public education in colonial America, it is clear that colonial Massachusetts was a theocracy. Its government, together with its church, prescribe the values and commitments of its people. In contrast to this, the Proprietors of Pennsylvania by their proclamations and enactments make it clear that in our province education was a matter for the family and, where appropriate, for the church or other forms of eleemosynary enterprise.

The declaration and constitution issued in 1776, 1789, and 1781, and in all the subsequent state documents including constitutions for the State of Pennsylvania, make it clear that the ideology of provincial Pennsylvania (as conceived by Quakers and enforced by Scotch Irish) became the essence of the American social contract. Out of it our constitutional government is understood primarily as a guarantor, not as a provider, not as a patron, not as a sponsor. This does not mean that government does not provide, patronize, or sponsor. Government does these things in its role as guarantor. It is not the prescriptor of the life style or standards, and, above all things, American government does not sponsor a special view of man and his relationship to God, society, or nature.

Thus, as guarantor government must tread a narrow path. What does it guarantee? It guarantees the conditions necessary

for the maximization of personal freedom. Among other things these include political rights, civil rights, personal protection, economic security, equal opportunity, religious freedom, and education. Defining these things can lead to numerous logical difficulties but many of these problems can be avoided if it is clearly understood that in regard to each of them the position of the government is that of guarantor and not that of either a benign or magisterial providence.

It is a narrow path indeed. But it does offer criteria whereby accountability can be shown. Government treads to the right of its path when it fails as guarantor. Thus when government fails to stand between the aggressor and the object of aggression, when it fails to stand between the exploiter and object of exploitation, when it fails to stand between abuser and object of abuse, it must be held to account. More picturesquely, it must be held to account if in mid-haircut one finds he has an incompetent barber; it must be held to account if in mid-appendectomy one finds he has an incompetent surgeon; it must be held to account when in mid-air one finds himself aboard a faulty airplane with an incompetent pilot; and it must be held to account if at mid-meal one finds his plate full of poisoned mushrooms. The doctrine of caveat emptor nowadays can apply only to simple things like shoes, pins, and nails. One should not reach mid-trial before he discovers that his lawyer

does not know cases and his judge does not know law. Modern life is too complex for the ancient doctrine of "buyer beware" and our social contract now requires the government to maintain a system of weights and measures for all kinds of public service including public teaching.

In modern times government also falls to the right of its path when it fails to provide free public education through the secondary school and open opportunity for public education through college and graduate school. This had not been a concern of government in colonial Pennsylvania where the curriculum of the plow, the rifle, and the axe with the marginal literacy provisions by parish schools and family tutoring did not fall within the range of governmental guarantees. But early in the last century it became clearly evident that such an education could not guarantee the social, intellectual, and economic mobility that would maximize personal freedom, and the social contract then required government to get on to its path by providing the public with schools, and it did.

Thus the advent of public education was not a romantic crusade led by a tiny number of militant humanists who snatched the torch of learning away from a self-perpetuating aristocracy and a domineering clergy. On the contrary, it was an appropriate and fitting response by government to the changing social and economic conditions of the times. Had that response not

been forthcoming the public would ultimately have held government to account. Nothing in the rhetoric of George Wolf or Thaddeus Stevens is more apparent than this. Despite the utopian tones of their discourse, the mode of their logic was that of necessity, possibility, and contingency.

The government must also be held to account when it steps to the left of its path. There are occasions, alas, many occasions when it tends to exceed the role of guarantor and becomes the prescriptor, the patron, or the magister. We know from contemporary events that the American public will hold government to account if it taps one more wire than is needed for the prosecution of criminality, if it audits one more income tax return than is necessary to insure compliance with law, if it conducts one more inquiry than is necessary to fulfill established equal justice, or if it drafts one soldier beyond that needed to guarantee national security. We abhor police administrators who keep files on citizens whose values differ from their own. We are willing that government tell us that liquor does us little good, but we have refused to allow government to stop us from drinking. The same is true of smoking. And one suspects that if it can be demonstrated that use of other drugs would not consummate in an unseemly burden on others we would likewise refuse to accept the constraints government now applies to them. The American social contract

does not include the notion that government may tell an American citizen what to do or not do about his personal life so long as his conduct of it does not infringe upon the guarantees the government must extend to others.

We have given government a narrow path to walk. It promenades as the guarantor of our rights and liberties, upholding them when they are endangered and resisting intrusion of all kinds, even of its own kind. It is the special genius of colonial America that such a government is created, and it is the continuing genius of the American people that are able to maintain it. The criteria of which I speak are the right hand and left hand boundaries of the path that we have insisted that our government tread. They have been shown to be valid and feasible by the two hundred year history of the American republic. It has seldom been easy, but it has always been done.

Now it is not the purpose of this discourse to raise specific <u>issues as issues</u>. There are disputes about the contemporary matters I propose now to discuss which if stirred could easily and quickly obscure the matter to which this paper is addressed, namely, how is the State Department of Education to be held accountable. I turn to these matters simply to examine how the State Department may deal with them in its capacity as guarantor. If my readers will grant this, then I can discuss contemporary problems not as issues in and

of themselves but as illustrations of points where department activities may be judged as rightful or as wrongful in the light of these suggested criteria. Thus, the purpose of the following paragraphs is to illuminate the criteria and not to take sides.

For example, the state secretary in recent events was well within his role as guarantor when he actively sought to assure girls equal opportunity for participation in athletic programs. It was his duty to see that young women have equal opportunity and he pursued the matter with appropriate vigor. I am reasonably certain that the common sense of all Pennsylvanians inveighs against efforts to subvert the purposes of this action. Anyone who knows anything about the social pressures which dominate adolescent populations does not expect to see men turning out for women's basketball or women turning out for football. The exceptions will be so few that they can be suffered. The teenagers will handle it themselves. But there is another matter of at least equal seriousness which has been neglected. To put this matter in a specific form, there are at least ten boys in my neighborhood who attempted to join a school athletic program and were cut from the team. The school in question offers nothing in its place so the boys are out on the town with little or nothing to do. I have heard their voiced resentment. Several, having

dieted and trained all summer for football, claim they were not given a chance because (they claimed) the coach had made his choices before the trials began. They understand they did not make the team because of inferior talents; they resent the situation.

I am sure we all agree that an athletic experience is an educational experience. Nowadays we do not deny educational experiences to anyone because their talents for learning are inferior. Thus, if we apply the criteria in question, the boys in my neighborhood and their families have every right to hold the State Department accountable for their unmet need. The State Department in its role as guarantor should rule that no school may be permitted to field a varsity team which has not first made provision for an appropriate athletic experience for all students who want it, regardless of their athletic talent. This criterion, I submit, is a valid one. Moreover, if it is desirable to rule that girls may play on boys' teams and boys play on girls' teams, it is also feasible to rule that all boys and girls who want team membership should have it in some form or no one should have team membership in any form. The logic of this judgment, I assert, is inexorable.

To take this particular matter one step further, one cannot find justification for the State choosing to exercise its

role as guarantor in one area, i.e., girls' rights to membership on boys' teams while standing silent on the right of all students to have access to athletic experience. If the State rules (and rightly so) that school athletics are a state concern because they are part of the educational program, then it cannot choose which athletic matters it will include within its concern and which it will not.

The purpose of this discourse is to illustrate where accountability exists and not to propose state actions. These matters are immensely complicated, and the apparatus by which accountability is determined and the response of government to such determination is necessarily deliberative, always intricate, and often perplexing. This is especially true in cases where the State Department exceeds its role as guarantor.

Here again, the issue is raised for purposes of illustration. The State, from time to time, and especially in recent years, has found itself involved in educational reform.

When a state prescribes <u>what kind</u> of education its people will practice upon themselves, it goes far in determining the life styles, commitments, and beliefs the people will hold. It is well known that the religious wars endured by our forefathers in sixteenth century Europe and Scotland were not simply to decide which church would exchange blessings with the ruling sovereign. At the heart of these terrible encounters

was the question of who would prescribe the values and commitments inherent in the catechismal education of the children. Our forefathers came to Pennsylvania with vivid memories of burnings, hangings, massacres, and forms of physical torture which coward the modern imagination. In this problem of government prescription of educational programs for children, it is important that we remember today what they remembered then.

Should the state sponsor a specific kind of educational reform, either by virtue of the schools themselves or through the education of their teachers? The answer to this is no. The education, of course, must be non-sectarian, but its value content, by the rule of heritage, must be determined at local levels. It must be determined by families, communities, and the officials they elect. The sophisticates in city center, the academic community, and the newspaper editors may deplore the values of main street, they may scorn it with high polemic; but, heedless to this, the State must guarantee the right of local determination. We are, by choice a diversified people, living together in a framework which turns our diversity into our primary strength.

Therefore, the State in its mandates should not enforce curricular provision which either states, implies, or advocates, no matter how subtlety, a special view of man, his nature, or

his purpose on earth. This should not be done in the programs for children and it should not appear in programs for teachers.

To illustrate my meaning, I make reference here to curriculum reform proposals outlined on what I shall call here the philosophy of *ratamorphism*.[1] Early in the present century biologists were warned against a growing tendency to project human thoughts and feelings into animals. In modern times we see the reverse of this. Today, instead of an anthromorphic vision of the rat we are swayed by a ratamorphic view of man. One need not turn to theories of special creation to find a challenge for the emerging behaviorist traditions which are grounded in this philosophy.

In evolution theory itself it is argued that man has three brains within his total intellectual apparatus; each of the three acquired at a separate stage of his development. The first is reptilian; the second is early mammalian and the third (which according to theory) is late mammalian makes man exclusively human.

(What is a human? Where sleeps a man there also sleeps an alligator and a horse.)

---

[1] With appreciation to Arthur Koestler, see *The Heel of Achilles* (New York: Random House).

This last brain which reportedly developed quickly within the time frame of evolution is the great neocortex which supposedly is the area responsible for signs, symbols, forms, ideas, language, and all the other powers of abstraction. It is not only the uniqueness and special properties of this new cerebral-psychic dimension which makes ratomorphism suspect; there are also the infinite ways in which this new region of the brain communicates, interacts, or responds to the old. The complexities of its special influences and powers over them and theirs over it makes the whole tradition of behaviorism a highly dubious ground upon which to build educational experiences for either children or their teachers.

If ratomorphism cannot meet the test imposed by evolution theory, how can it hope to stand against others which are grounded in theology, traditional humanism, philosophical dualism, or ethical humanism. Behavioral modification schemes with their increasing stress on systems, networks, Skinnerian boxes, rewards, reinforcement, etc., etc., come off being a new and special view of life, and the educational programs which result from them are nothing more than a new ontological plea.

I would not deny the right or even the worth of behavioral modification research among high mammals. But I am prepared to object to the capitulation of all education theory to this

neophyte science. If objections to it fail, and ratomorphism continues rampant, a teacher may well have to prepare, as Koestler suggests, for the day one of his charges grows whiskers and bites him on the finger.

The State also oversteps its boundary when it attempts a specific definition of quality education. The recent Report of the Citizens Commission on Basic Education reasserts ten previously defined goals of quality education which, alas, were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1965. These goals make use of a logical format which holds quality education is what quality education does. In nearly all of these goals quality education is said to help the child to acquire something. Thus we are driven to conclude that quality education must lead to a set of acquisitions. In this case the acquisitions vary in their clarity and specificity. The Citizens Commission urges these goals as a foundation for curriculum development.

To be sure the writers of such goals are convinced of their own philosophical neutrality and of the axiological innocence of their work. To disabuse them of this attitude we have only to ask them: What are we to do about the Socratic conviction that education develops the innate qualities of the man? What are we to do about the scholastic view that education must develop the logical and intuitive powers of the mind, or about Dewey's argument that education entails the reconstruction of human

experience? These are but three of perhaps a dozen such questions which could be raised about any effort to define quality education by an enumeration of its parts.

Again, I can construct an argument to support behaviorism, and I can even build a defense for the "Ten Goals". My polemic here is to supply added warrant to my assertion that the State Department in endorsing these prescriptions has violated the social contract. Special views of man and value laden definitions of quality education are off-limits to government.

But it does not mean the state ignores such matters. The state must, in effect, attend to a truth-in-packaging guarantee. If a local school develops what purports to be a liberal arts curriculum then the state is obliged to satisfy itself that the curriculum is outlined on a defensible theory of liberal education. More than this; it is obliged to satisfy itself that the provisions or resources needed are present and operating efficiently. In this way the state does not advocate the program, but stands as guarantor that the program is everything it is advertised to be.

The state can help quality education by advocating diversity (and flexibility), and by supporting research in pedagogy, but it should never advocate a special educational format as policy. Here the state can do for its schools and colleges what good classroom teachers do in their schools. The state can serve as

a catalyst for the natural development of the institutions which lie within its borders. Again, to do this without prescription means working on a very narrow path.

Can it be done? I think it can, and generally speaking, it is. The Report of the Citizens Commission on Basic Education which I may have unfairly abused in my effort to depict a certain type of problem has much in it that I find commendable. Among other things, it urges the very reform in school athletics which I have indicated herein that it is the state's duty to guarantee. In many other ways this citizens' report convinces me that the people of our state know the valid and feasible criteria which should guide our state department to an understanding of its own accountability. If they did not their report could not possibly contain the marvelous paragraph that concludes its opening chapter. The report declares:

> The "mindlessness" found in many school policies and procedures can only be overcome if schools begin to look at themselves, and if they initiate a continuing dialogue with their communities to ensure common understanding of and agreement with the ends which schools seek to accomplish. School directors, administrators, teachers, students, and committees should join efforts in developing personalized instructional programs which they can all understand and support.

It is the duty of the State Department to see that the vision of that paragraph is incarnated in the institutions of education in Pennsylvania. And when, where, or if these

things do not happen the State Department should be held to account. Thus, the answer this paper provides to the question of criteria appears already known to both the citizens of Pennsylvania and their public servants. It just seems that from time to time a reminder is needed.

Instead of trying to illuminate the educational landscape of the State with one brilliant beacon, energized by a power plant within the State Department of Education, the Secretary and his colleagues should attempt to spangle the state from border to border with a thousand or more lights, some of them of different color, hue, and intensity, but all brightly burning, powered by the energy, resources, imaginations, and commitments of the people of the cities, towns, and hamlets of this remarkable Commonwealth.

Q. Should more money be allocated by the legislature for support of education in Pennsylvania?

R. (Dr. Stoops) As an administrator for over 22 years, I am one who has always managed to finish in the red. I happened to be engaged in a study of the history of education in Northampton County. This has been a fascinating experience, and I took it on as a public duty. As I get deeper and deeper into it, I find some extraordinary dimensions to 19th century education. For example, in the Easton Express every year when the County Institute was held, the Express published, word for

word, an account of everything that was said. Not only did that newspaper do it, but all others throughout the Commonwealth, by and large, took a great interest in the County Institute. I am led to make the inference that in those days, there was an awful lot of public talk about what the schools were and what they were doing. The school principal was a local celebrated man, celebrated one way or another, but nevertheless a celebrated man; so was the school superintendent. There was a different atmosphere, but I think the people in the communities were involved in a way that they do not get involved when we try to create a system that does all of this for them. The state system and all its sub-systems will do this kind of thinking that only can take place when human beings meet with human beings to talk about their schools. I think in bygone days there was more talk about what goes on in Pennsylvania's schools by citizens in local communities than there is today. When they hear about these massive institutions that sit on a hill with yellow busses streaming in and concentrating 3,000 or 4,000 adolescents inside of one spot, I think that this is what I hope would happen, but I don't know how money is connected with it. I will say that it is a matter of maybe shifting emphasis on the part of the state officials. Instead of saying come to us and we will sit down together and determine policies, they should send

people out for the purpose of insisting that local schools form policies. This is, I think, a different emphasis. It probably would cost more money, everything does, but I don't know how much. I think that it is more a change in philosophy, a change in approach to the whole matter of how the state will govern.

Q. Are you willing to accept the ambiguities that will go with having highlights, dim lights, and bright lights all at the same time in education?

R. (Dr. Stoops) I think that if the light is dim or going out from time to time, the state has to get in there and do a job in a local area. One thing that I think we could be edified by is to read the county superintendent's reports which go back into about 1850 and beyond. We can see how the county superintdent's used to work in order to get local support. I come from a part of the state where some of the people did not want public schools, and they didn't want them with a passion. These people got to work to stir and persuade the citizens of that community to do something about their schools. As I read these reports, and some are written in very flowery and colorful language, as these were men of classical background, they were committed to the idea of localism, and they thought it their duty, as I interpret it, to see that this worked, and not to take it over themselves. I

think increasingly, we are trying to stand the pyramid on its head, and it doesn's balance easily that way.

R. (Commissioner Ziegler) I thought that the paper was extremely interesting, and I would like to make one or two comments. The role of the state as guarantor, I would certainly agree with. What I wonder about is the role of the state as leader. You seem to deny that as a proper function in some of your remarks, but I think the state has always been the leader in the sense that it has protected the socialization and the vision and the ideals of the community; whether it is a small community or a national community. From the time of the Greeks, education in the Western world has been intimately bound up with policy, which means with politics, because ultimately that means the allocation of scarce resources. I don't see how you can avoid that! So the question would be how to surround the state by a variety of constraints to prevent it from becoming a tyrant, and that's the history of the Western world. I think that the implication of what you say as to the role of the state department and the state board, are as follows: it must attend to many publics, if it doesn't do that, its not providing a proper duty; it must respond with policies to meet the needs of the people as they express it, but there is a problem there, and that is that different localities are often in conflict, and that requires

the state to be a mediator because we are a government of interests. As soon as that happens, the state must take a value position it cannot just mediate among conflicts and say you are all equal. I think the state has to develop policies which respond to change. And finally, I think the state department and state board has an important role as guarantor of consumer protection. I find it difficult to substantiate the opposite of your point about quality education. You say why should the state be concerned about the goals of quality education, and that it strays from social contract. My answer to that, Dean Stoops, is that if the state is not the guarantor, or not interested in quality, you would not want it to be interested in nonequality. And so by that kind of opposites I want to come back to the first statement that I made - that the state cannot be neutral, it never can be neutral; it is, in fact, the chief model for our community of a set of values, norms, and of visions.

R. (Dr. Stoops) I can respond to some of those things. Thank you for your discerning commentary on much of what I had to say, and also bringing out some points so that I can clear misunderstandings that are possible from certain elements in the discourse. First of all, on the question of leadership. Leadership can have one of several attitudes, and I question very strongly, the attitude of leadership which

tends to build a kind of monolithic system and does not tend to work on the natural dynamics of the people, as though to assume that they are not there. I think the danger here is arguing the principle of the excluded middle where you suggest that my paper takes one extreme and you are suggesting the other extreme. It seems to me that a wise governor does, somehow, rise beyond the middle range, or mediocre, by stimulating people to do things for themselves. I'm not suggesting that we have policies coming down the pike that are going to take care of all of this for you. In the first place, I don't think that people are that naive; in the second place, they have heard that for many decades, and they don't believe it anymore. As far as quality education is concerned, you've touched upon the point, and I offered a critique of the Ten Goals. I think the state was right in convening a group to talk about quality education. I think that it was wrong in endorsing a specific form. I still argue that quality education can take a variety of forms, even within a school. People have asked me from time to time - what's a good school? I've responded by saying that a good school is a place where a given student is growing and developing felicitiously. You say - is Lehigh a good school? It could be or it could not be depending on what's happening to one individual student. So we define quality education person by person, and not by

a state proclamation. The things that I have found to be of quality in my own educational experience, other people have not. I think what the state is responsible for is rigor, integrity, and to make sure that our institutions are fulfilling their promise, whatever that promise is. I think that is the public interest, and not to prescribe for the institution any particular format by which they could preserve the public interest. I'm doing this, I think they should sponsor research in behaviorism and in various other areas. But they should not endorse the results of any researcher's findings, but merely disseminate and inform the user of the product that he must satisfy himself that this meets his particular needs.

Q. Even if the state could usurp the powers that you say it should not, would it not lack the resources and expertise to pull it off?

R. (Dr. Stoops) I tend to agree to the extent that American experience supports this contention. We, as a people, have not been brought along in the tradition of obedience. You have only to note the differences between the six-year old in the American first grade and their counterparts in a German Volkschula. They are little men and women. But, if you get to the point where a state would regard itself as having a ministry of education, and all the powers would

extend from the top on down, you would get an American public so lethargic and so accustomed to being told what's right to the point that they would accept that, and I can't imagine this, but suppose it could be done, as it is done in certain parts of the world. If it got to that point in Pennsylvania they would have to use the 28th Division to enforce it.

Q. When you speak of the state as being leader, do you mean leader as pusher, or does leader imply pusher, and is pushing necessary?

R. (Commissioner Ziegler) I think it depends on the issue. Take the issue of "equal opportunity in education" about which this administration is greatly concerned. If you talk about curriculum reform, I think I am with Dr. Stoops. It seems to me there are some concerns of the state which require the state to act as leader; and I mean that group of people who are in those offices at that moment trying to understand the public interest. The state doesn't have a view of issues different from the public interest; if it does, it doesn't stay in office very long, it gets changed.

Q. Isn't it here that the issue is not so clear? For example, in integration, the Philadelphia schools are not integrated, so is it the states' role to lead in this integration? It is clear in the example you give of curriculum

reform, since there can be agreement regarding curriculum, but there are areas where there is not agreement, and the public will not tolerate immediate integration. The response is that the integration process takes time. What is the leadership role of the state in such an issue? Is this where there must be prodding or pushing?

R. (Dr. Stoops) Could I respond to this! Those of us who get into the work of administration have a rule-of-thumb for knowing when one is doing a good job or a bad job. You are doing a good job if you are able to anticipate crises of one kind or another, and move in with programs that soften the impact. You are doing a bad job when you are going around putting out fires. Now we know that in the situation of center city, with respect to school integration, that we have not only one, but a series of crises. Here, I would suggest that the state's responsibility for leadership is to have programs in human relations and programs of various kinds well in advance of a court mandate. Not to sit back and wait for the courts to act, and have them submit a plan which gets a violent public response. It seems to me that a prudent government, any government, would anticipate and know that sooner or later as guarantors, they have got to remedy a situation, and if they allow it to develop to a point of impact before they are able to do anything about it, they

have failed in their mission as leader. If we are going to have a problem in Philadelphia, I submit that the state should have programs going there now, and not after the court mandate is issued.

R. (Dr. Southworth) I'd like to make a couple of observations. I live in the city, but this commonwealth does not have an urban mentality; it has a rural mentality. This has bothered me. I come from Michigan, and I'm intrigued by the term "Commonwealth" of Pennsylvania. We could have a group of city-states that have to be drawn together to form a state which acts as a guarantor, but as guarantor the state must also provide leadership at that level. This American system has survived 200 years, and I think John Stoops' reminder is timely. I'm not sure that you are as practical as you ought to be in terms of 1975, and what's needed. I don't feel constrained by the state guidelines that I talked about yesterday, in terms of external and internal criteria that are out there, but not clearly refined and implementable. I vary somewhat from your position in that the state ought to provide some alternatives to help these problems, not prescribe one single approach. Yet, I think the vehicles are available in terms of long range planning for school districts, which is a perfect example to facilitate local initiative, local values, and local commitment. And the state has to see to it that this

is done equitably across the Commonwealth. Program approval gives us ample license to use local initiative at the institutional level. I regard CBTE as an exploratory opportunity, and cannot see it as a prescriptor. I think as we've looked at the excesses of Watergate, I doubt if the public or the profession will allow any segment or agency, or institution of our society to go too far. I just have to believe in the system.

R. (Dr. Kies, PDE) It has been stated that there is a distinction between mandating or prescribing any approach, and leadership by alternative, if you will. It seems to me as I restate that, that one of our responsibilities as attenders to our many publics, has to be clarity of communication. When we talk about CBTE, for example, and allow people to assume that we are talking about behaviorism, we haven't stated very clearly our position, which is curriculum reform, by any other name. We make a mistake then in not exerting leadership in a clearly delineated fashion, and that may be something for which we ought to be held accountable.

R. (Dr. Cornell, PSEA) The paper delineated many good things that ought to be brought out. One thing that many people do not understand is that in 1968 the Constitution of Pennsylvania was amended, and one of the quiet changes that very few noticed, was that they changed one sentence about

education that appears in the Constitution. It was changed from stating that "the state shall provide a thorough efficient system of education," to which someone added "this shall be done for the benefit of the state." With all this presentation, I wonder where we all were when the constitution was changed and the sentence was added that "this shall be done for the benefit of the state?" What then is the function of the state to carry out this mandate? It seems to me that this is the role of the department of education and it does have as its job to see to it that the citizens of Pennsylvania are educated, and to see to it that each school district provides an effective education for each student.

R. (Dr. Stoops) I'd like to respond to that! Dr. Cornell, I got into a situation last year by trying to be of some service to New Jersey as that state was struggling at the time with the question of what can be done with a school district that does not provide a thorough and efficient education. We tried to work out several logical propositions that would serve as a test to the terms "thorough and efficient." First of all, I would like to see our state department stop thinking of themselves as a minor bureaucracy, they are educators. It doesn't bother me so much that the chief may be a political appointment, but I believe that is an educational organization, and should so stand. Their utterances

in education should be discussed on every pulpit, and in every newspaper, and they should raise questions with every school district. Now that is the positive approach to the problem. Secondly, I think there ought to be, also, in the role of guarantor, the possibility that the state can take a school district into educational receivership. In essence, to declare a school district to be bankrupted, if there are sufficient complaints and problems eminating, and sufficient state concerns registered, either through the teachers association or some other agency of reporting. Evaluations must be called for, and school boards can be summarily removed. The state should have the power in its role of guarantor to take a school district into receivership that is so thoroughly corrupt in its responsibility that it is either guilty of malfeasance or nonfeasance. I think we need, on the one hand, to do everything we can to turn Pennsylvania on to education at the grass roots level, while on the other hand, I think we should have the power of enforcement in the hands of the state department. I would not hesitate to see something like that written into law. I have recommended that to another state and it was favorably received by a committee. I think there are some provisions for state intervention that can be worked out.

Q. I agree that colleagues in the department of education

are educators. However, the office of Secretary of Education is an appointed official by an elected Governor whose term of service is limited. How can we resolve the leadership coming from an office where one's longevity may be relatively short compared to those whose life work is in education?

R. (Dr. Stoops) Politicization of the chief school officer is a new experience in Pennsylvania. In former times the chief school officer was part of the profession all of his life, and to some extent responded to the protocol of the profession. Sometimes we had state superintendents who were in office for a great many years, and they were regarded as professionals and not as political appointments. That is not to say that there are not professional politics, you have professional politics everywhere, even on university faculties, and in mens bible classes of churches. I'm talking about public politics and we're on a different level. I think that the action by the Governor, and I don't mean to focus the discussion on the single personality of our present Secretary, does represent a decisive turn if it is to become a precedent in public affairs in Pennsylvania. Which means that it could be a good thing if all elements of the profession, the classroom teachers, professors of education, and everyone, were to go public. In previous years we were content to have our dialogue in smaller circles and to effect

our critique in limited journals with limited circulation. I'm talking with my colleagues in educational philosophy about this, they charge that I'm trying to politicize educational philosophy, but I say no, I'm trying to philosophize educational politics. It's a different kind of thing. We are trying to put educational discussions on to some kind of higher ground. If we are forced to do this because of the move on the part of the present Governor to appoint a professional politician to the office of Secretary of Education, then I think that history will have shown that Governor Shapp had done a good thing if it gets us out of a shell and into the public sector and makes education a matter of real public discussion. In response to the question then, only time will tell. I don't know where I stand on this particular question. I don't know whether the Governor asked anyone if he should appoint a political secretary, but he did, and if it becomes a precedent then I think it means a difference in our professional style.

Q. What is the role of the state department in competing with other vested interests in the state for the tax dollar, and making sure that education gets its fair share?

R. (Dr. Stoops) I think the state department has to be an advocate before the General Assembly and the State Board of Education. In all institutions, where a central budgeting

system operates, the various agencies are almost in adversary positions to compete for the resources. The state department is not an autonomous thing, it is not a cost center, it must receive money. I believe also that the state department in this role ought to have a more clearly articulated philosophy of leadership, particularly as it applies to questions as to how its leadership will register upon local school districts than it has or does now. All of these notions however, I think grow out of my conviction that we are to understand the state department as the guarantor of these things, and I appreciate the fact that it is a very, very narrow path. This is one of the things that I want to stress in commenting here. On that path it certainly must do what it can to insure that adequate resources flow to the places where it has invoked its guarantee; namely, in the public sector.

WHAT VALID AND FEASIBLE CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO HOLD THE TEACHING PROFESSION ACCOUNTABLE FOR INTERACTION BETWEEN AND AMONG THE VARIETY OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS?

J. WILLIAM MOORE
Chairman, Department of Education
Bucknell University

In the evaluation of individual programs, organizations, and positions in our State educational system, consideration is usually given to questions of validity and feasibility of evaluation. For example, in researching the effectiveness of teacher behavior, probably the most valid criteria is a measure of learner performance. However, in evaluating the effectiveness of a teacher preparation program, most often it is feasible to determine the validity of the program only by assessing the rational relationship between the desired teaching behavior and learner performance and the proposed procedures designed to produce these desired behaviors. To attempt to impose a policy which requires an institution of higher education to demonstrate an empirical relationship between the procedures which it utilizes to train teachers and the effectivensss of these procedures, while desirable, is totally and completely impractical. Specifically, while such a policy would satisfy the criteria of validity, it does not satisfy the condition of feasibility.

If one assumes that the criteria associated with the validity of individual programs (whether they be school district programs, teacher education programs, or programs developed by the State Department of Education) have been satisfied, can it be assumed also that all of the crucial questions concerning the validity of our public education instructional system have been answered? In spite of the fact that our professional actions would seem to indicate an affirmative response to this question, I surmise that most of you would agree with me in stating that the apparent validity of each individual program is not sufficient evidence for assuring us that the total system is valid. Specifically, I am suggesting that an important question concerning the validity of our educational system, not often raised, is what is the relation of the individual program, for example, teacher education or State Department programs, etc., as they interact in affecting the quality of the outcome of our total educational program for the State. The problem, to put it in the language of systems people, is that where there are a number of interacting subsystems in a total system and where these systems are, at least in part, hierarchically related, the subsystems, while demonstrating a degree of internal validity, may be not only mutually nonsupportive but they may be, in fact, antagonistic if viewed from a total systems (a

Macrosystems) point of view. For example, often an individualized instructional system which requires the teacher to work more directly with individual students is implemented, without making appropriate changes in the administrative support system which required the teacher to work more directly with individual students is implemented, without making appropriate changes in the administrative support system with respect to teaching load. That is, the administrative subsystem often continues to define teaching load in terms of numbers of courses, rather than numbers of students taught per day as required by the new system. In spite of the demonstrated validity of an individualized instructional program, it can be predicted that it is not likely to survive because it is in a de facto antagonistic relation with the hierarchically related system. It follows then, that to maximize the probability that an educational system will be valid, the relationship of the various subsystems must be determined. To the extent that subsystems are mutually supportive in relation to the desired outcome of the total system and to the extent that the individual subsystems are valid, the desired outcomes of the total system can be predicted.

Since it is not feasible to design a totally new educational system for the State which satisfies these conditions--

although some of us might like to try if given a chance--the immediate questions are, from a total systems view, how valid are our existing subsystems, and what must we do to increase their validity? While there are probably many ways of answering this question, I believe an instrumental learning model can be used productively in raising questions concerning the nature of the validity of a total system with its interacting subsystem. Simply, I am suggesting that we must know in advance of the development of the system what behaviors we desire (i.e., what outcomes we desire), what reinforcement procedures we are going to use to maximize the probability that the behaviors once displayed are likely to reoccur, and finally, what are the contingency conditions that we will arrange to maximize the probability that both the behaviors will be produced and the reinforcers will be associated with the desired behaviors. To put it in other terms, the criteria for evaluating the validity of individual and interacting subsystems may be stated as follows: (1) Were the outcomes of the desired subsystem or subsystems clearly specified?" (2) Were the criteria (outcomes) relevant?; and, (3) Were the contingency conditions and reinforcers appropriate with respect to the production of the desired outcome?

The usefulness of the first question, i.e., the

purposeful specification of the criteria, seems so obvious that it should not require further comment. Yet, I would argue that this criteria is all too infrequently applied in a purposeful way. Specifically, one must not simply specify only what the desired outcome(s) of the system or subsystem is; rather, one must observe what behaviors (outcomes) are actually being produced. For example, when actual outcomes of two mutually supportive subsystems are not discrepant from the originally specified outcomes, one may conclude that both are valid. However, unless the outcomes are purposely specified--and most often they are not--the discrepancy which actually exists may pass unnoticed. For example, it seems safe to assume that the outcomes of the University's teacher education subsystem and the outcomes of the supervisory subsystem of a public school are to produce and maintain effective teaching behavior. Yet, while the teaching behavior of young graduates who are just beginning to teach is often judged to be highly effective, after a few months or perhaps a few years in a given school setting, these very desirable behaviors seem to disappear, only to be replaced by a set of behaviors more like that of the lowest form of teaching exhibited in the schools. In fact, this change in behavior often occurs without the administrative supervisory system recognizing that there has been any significant change whatsoever. To

see this problem, one need only ask almost any school district for the evidence they have collected concerning the effectiveness of their supervisory program in terms of evaluating teaching behavior. To the extent that this information is not available, there is no way of assessing the validity of the supervisory program. Therefore, the behaviors being reinforced may be, in fact, antagonistic to those produced in the teacher education program. Parenthetically, I need to say at this point that there are obviously other subsystems operating within the school system which could cause a regression in teaching behavior as well as the supervisory system.

Hopefully, the importance of specifying the outcomes for an individual subsystem as well as the total system of which the subsystem is a part is apparent. Possibly less apparent is the importance of specifying the appropriateness of the outcomes of the respective subsystems. The earlier example of the individualized instructional system again may be used to illustrate this point. For example, let us assume (1) that the relevant criteria of an educational system is increased learner performance, and (2) that an individualized instructional system is implemented with the relevant criteria being a criterion referenced individually paced program. What should be the relevant criteria (outcome) specified for the

administrative subsystem in relation to the individualized instructional program? Since it can be argued that these two systems are hierarchically related, the relevant goals of the administrative subsystem should include the development and implementation of a new definition of a teaching load. Obviously, there are other relevant goals which one must also specify for this subsystem if the individualized instructional system is to function. However, again the point is that if relevant goals (outcomes) (in this case, teaching load) are not specified, the actual goal of the "control" subsystem may be antagonistic to the goals of the lower order system and thus reduce the effectiveness of the subordinate subsystem. In actual practice, how often are the relevance of the goals of a given subsystem evaluated in terms of other dependent or mutually supportive subsystems?

Assuming that outcomes had been specified and that the outcomes of the respective subsystems are relevant, another question must be raised: Are the contingency conditions and reinforcers associated with the production of these outcomes appropriate? I am convinced that an examination of almost any of the subsystems of Pennsylvania's State Education System would indicate that even if appropriate relevant outcomes were established, the contingency conditions associated with the production of these goals are invalid. To the extent

that this is true, it is no wonder that education in this State is so ineffective. For example, consider the classroom instructional subsystem. If teaching involves the diagnosis and remediation of individual learner problems, then there is no way that even the best teachers can satisfy this definition of teaching, when confronted with 30 pupils per class, five to six periods a day. We all agree that effective teaching requires time for planning for individual differences. Yet, in practice, little time is provided for this critical aspect of teaching to occur. Certainly, lip service is not enough to insure the validity of an instructional system. Rather, the contingency conditions--in this case, time--must be provided to increase the probability that the desired teaching behaviors can occur. For this reason, it is clear, in actual practice, that our classroom instructional subsystem is invalid, even if relevant criteria have been specified.

Because of the importance of providing the appropriate contingency and reinforcement conditions for a subsystem or a combination of subsystems to be valid, I would like to provide a number of additional examples to illustrate this point. For example, I question the validity of the use of appointed "citizen" committees to help determine program procedures for use in instructional improvement in the public schools or for advising in the development of the curriculum of a teacher

preparation program, or for recommending programs to prepare chemists, or recommending programs to develop the technology to send men to the moon, etc. Citizen committees do not have the technical competencies to develop programs (produce the desired behaviors for the subsystems). Yet, from an examination of most educational systems in recent years, I have found that a significant number of non-professionals have become a part of almost every committee which supposedly has as its purpose the development of more effective instructional systems. The Citizens Commission on Basic Education which deals with teacher preparation is a case in point. For the same reason, i.e., the appropriateness of the contingency condition, I also question the validity of committees appointed to determine the role of education in society, or whether we should be sending men to the moon, or whether we should be training more M.D.'s, etc., which are made up primarily of professionals in their respective areas. Laymen are much more likely to produce the appropriate behaviors related to these decisions than are professionals because: (1) a technical knowledge is not necessary to make the decision, and (2) the professional is more likely to make a less appropriate decision (outcome) because of the conflict of interest with his profession. In terms of my own bias, the tremendous control which the medical profession has over

Blue Cross and Blue Shield, illustrates this point beautifully.

At another level of our educational system, it also can be argued that education is too important to leave in the hands of professional educators or that our legal system is too important to leave in the hands of the legal profession. This argument gives support for the appointment of non-professional people to State cabinet posts. Since these appointees are one of the contingency conditions in this subsystem (the State Cabinet post), the question must be asked, Are non-professionals capable of producing the type of behaviors for which the Cabinet post was designed? For example, if the primary goal of the Secretary of Education's position is to provide society with a means of controlling the "Education complex," so that it will serve society's needs rather than its own, then it would seem to follow logically that a non-professional in the position of Secretary would have the highest probability of behaving in ways consistent with the position. However, if the primary purpose of the position is to develop and maintain a system of education which is maximally effective in satisfying specific needs of a society, it would follow that a professional educator would be most likely to behave in ways consistent with these ends. (Whether the individual is elected or appointed is also an important

contingency but will not be discussed here.) What is interesting about the position of Secretary of Education is that, until the appointment of the present Secretary, the position was always filled by a professional educator. Thus, when evaluating the validity of the Secretary of Education position and recognizing the nature of the change in the contingency condition of a professional to a non-professional, two questions need to be asked. First, was the desired outcome of the present position changed in a way which required a non-professional to be appointed to maximize the probability that the goals or the outcomes would be produced, and, if so, were related subsystems, e.g., administrative structures and procedures in the Department of Education changed to accommodate the change in the Secretary's position?

The failure to answer this question adequately can only result in an invalid State educational system. Second, if only part of the primary responsibilities of that position assumed by the Secretary were changed, one would have reason to question the ability of the non-professional to produce all of the types of behavior required of this system. My guess is that much of the concern being expressed by laymen and professionals, e.g., school board members, parents and professional educators, for the observed decisions of the Secretary, is that some changes have been made in that

subsystems which make it more valid in some respects and less valid in others. Specifically, it is my opinion that the present position has a potential for producing outcomes of the type which require both professional and non-professional decisions. Thus, when the current Secretary makes decisions which require professional competence, the decisions may be invalid. Conversely, when he makes decisions requiring non-professional competence, they are probably more valid than if a professional had made them. To the extent that this is true, then the problem is an invalid subsystem because the contingency conditions necessary for producing the desired outcomes cannot be provided completely in an appointed secretary. Unfortunately, the common simplistic approach to the problem is to find fault with the man who fills the position, rather than to evaluate his potential as a contingency condition in the total system.

Finally, I would like to attempt to illustrate the effects of the failure to take into consideration appropriate contingency conditions between and among subsystems. In this illustration, the professional licensing of people competent to teach in the State of Pennsylvania will be specified as a desired outcome of the system. It can be argued that currently there are two subsystems responsible for professional licensing in the State of Pennsylvania. Approved colleges

and universities within the State represent one subsystem, while the other is represented by inservice councils under the direct control of the Department of Education. The two subsystems supposedly differ in that the former is concerned primarily with provisional certification and the latter with permanent certification. The two systems are both alike in that they are concerned ultimately in providing a program of education which will assure society that all professionals who are licensed will demonstrate a common set of competencies at a satisfactory level in any school district throughout the State. While the objectives are supposedly the same, i.e., both are concerned with the goal of licensing; an examination of the nature of the subsystem suggests that one subsystem has the potential for producing these behaviors while the other not only has little potential for producing these behaviors but may, in fact, be reinforcing a set of competing behaviors. An examination of the university program suggests that the economic survival of a teacher education program is a primary reirforcer for the maintenance of the program and is dependent on two factors: (1) the approval of the program by the State, and (2) the matriculation of a sufficient number of students who are capable of successfully completing the program. In the first case, because the institution has little control over the appointed

evaluation team, there is reason to believe that the appraisal of the program by the team should be relatively unbiased in relation to the need of the local institution being evaluated and should reflect the professional licensing concern of the State. Second, assuming an approved program, students will enroll only if their potential for licensing is great and they have a high probability of being employed. Thus, where the outcome of the system is to produce teachers who can demonstrate a set of competencies appropriate for teaching in all school settings throughout the State, an institution of higher education would seem to provide the necessary conditions for producing these outcomes.

The reinforcement and contingency conditions associated with the "inservice training" subsystem for professional licensing presents quite a different picture. In this case, the inservice council (one of the contingency conditions) is made up of local educators and the economic survival of the inservice program is dependent on the extent to which the individual needs of the local districts are satisfied by that program. Because of the vested interest of the local inservice council in local school problems and concerns, the probability of designing and approving programs which satisfy the requirement for professional licensing, that is, a common set of competencies appropriate for any school district, is very low.

Rather, it would seem that the type of program that the in-service council is most likely to approve would be more specifically designed to satisfy the needs of a given district. An examination of the inservice programs indicates that in most cases the programs approved do not satisfy the needs associated with professional licensing. I have asked a rather large number of teachers why they take these courses. They usually answer, "I can count them toward a Master's equivalency and receive an additional salary increment." Or, "It's the easiest way to satisfy my permanent certification requirements." On the surface, it would appear that for some, the subsystem is functioning in leading to professional licensing. However, an examination of the definition of professional licensing associated with inservice training indicates that it differs greatly from the earlier definition which implies a common set of competencies. In this case, it is defined simply as an accumulation of 24 inservice credits. Thus, a very different set of behaviors associated with licensing are being reinforced. In the University approved program, the behaviors are a common set of competencies for all teachers, but in the inservice program there is an accumulation of unspecified courses. While the differences in specified outcomes, e.g., differences in definition of professional licensing, are important, the important points I

wish to make are: (1) even if the more appropriate definition of professional licensing were specified, it is unlikely that it would be achieved because of inappropriate reinforcement and contingency conditions and (2) this being the case, then the only hope for correcting the situation is to modify one or more of the higher order subsystems, e.g., the Department of Education and State Board of Education, which control the reinforcement and contingency conditions of the inservice system.

With respect to the first point, the inservice council is an inappropriate contingency condition for producing the desired behaviors associated with professional licensing, because it is controlled by local districts. The outcomes which this council is likely to produce are likely to be more consistent with local needs or demands than the general requirements of all school districts. Further, if the reinforcement for participation is associated with ease of credit accumulation rather than acquired competence, it is predictable that the desired behaviors will not be produced. This is not a criticism of inservice councils if inservice councils are established to approve inservice courses which are aimed at satisfying the needs of a given district, but it is a criticism of inservice councils, if inservice councils approve courses which supposedly are related to professional

licensing, i.e., permanent certification.

To understand why the inservice subsystem is invalid as a prerequisite for producing the desired outcomes, one needs to evaluate the reinforcement and contingency conditions of the subsystems which create and control the inservice subsystems. In the case of the inservice program, the Department of Education probably appointed committees for studying the problem of inservice training and professional licensing. After a review of the recommendations of this appointed committee, the Department probably made recommendations to the Secretary and the State Board concerning inservice training, licensing, and in the most recent case, Master's equivalency. Following action of the State Board, the Department then became the contingency condition for developing and carrying out the inservice program. Using the illustration of inservice training, I am told that Basic Education recommended to the State Board that inservice credit be counted toward the Master's equivalency. Since a Master's equivalency in many schools counts toward or can be used for a salary increase, and since the State Board approved the inservice council system, it is easy to see the influence of the Department of Education and State Board subsystem on the local inservice subsystem. Specifically, they have provided strong incentives for teachers to participate in inservice

programs by counting credits toward both a Master's equivalency and professional licensing, and they have developed the inservice councils as the contingency condition for producing the outcomes. Yet, how often have we, as educators, taken time to question the validity of systems which control the inservice councils? Rather, our criticisms are usually limited to the subsystem most immediately associated with the undesirable outcome, e.g., the local inservice councils. Thus, it can be seen that while the validity of the reinforcement and contingency conditions associated with inservice training can be evaluated in terms of the outcomes of the system, the causal factors related to validity must be determined in terms of the validity of higher order subsystems.

This general point can be summarized as follows: If empirical evidence is available indicating that appropriate outcome of the subsystem has been produced, it can be assumed that the contingency conditions are valid. However, in the design and evaluation of a system, the only feasible criterion for evaluating the validity of contingency systems is the logical relationship between the desired outcomes and those proposed conditions judged appropriate for producing the outcomes. With respect to a total systems approach, it is critical to remember that the relation of the various subsystems also represents contingency conditions and thus

must be considered from the same prospective as an individual subsystem.

To summarize, I am suggesting that until the profession takes into consideration the validity of its total system rather than simply examining the effectiveness of one or more of its component subsystems, such as teacher preparation or the teaching program in the schools, little progress will be made in increasing the effectiveness of education for the children in the Commonwealth.

Questions associated with the validity and feasibility of interactive instructional systems.

A. What are the desired educational outcomes of our public educational system?

B. The following represent a list of subsystems which interact in determining the educational outcomes of our Pennsylvania's Educational System. Please expand the list!

1. The Office of Secretary of Education
2. The State Board of Education
3. The State Department of Education
4. The State School Boards Association
5. The Teacher training institutions
6. Local School Districts
    a. classroom instructional systems
    b. administrative systems

c. local teachers' organizations

7. The State P.S.E.A.

C. Specify the relevant outcomes for each of your listed subsystems where the outcome of the total system is effective classroom instruction. (Realistically, you may wish to limit your list to three closely related subsystems.)

Can you defend the relevance of your outcomes as they relate to higher or lower order subsystems?

What are the de factor outcomes of these existing subsystems and how do they compare with yours?

D. Specify the probable sources of reinforcement and the probable contingency conditions of each of the subsystems.

1. Are these reinforcers appropriate?
2. Are the contingency conditions appropriate?
3. If not, how would you change the specific subsystem or higher order subsystem in ways which are more likely to produce the desired outcomes? Remember evaluation must not only stand the test of validity, it must also be feasible.

Q. Can you advocate which system the profession ought to use in the quasi political arena to attack the issues, to speak with one voice, or to in general, answer the questions you have raised?

R. (Dr. Moore) No, I haven't given any particular thought to what the profession ought to do. On the other hand, since that is a contingency condition, the answer is that if the desired outcomes are not being produced, then we have to design a procedure to deal with it; a procedure which has a high probability of producing these kinds of outcomes. Dr. Stoops' comment was appropriate if, in fact, the politicization of the Secretary of Education position is going to continue then my response is that the profession has to have its voice heard. Which is to say that we are reacting politically. The fact that we are here today is an exemplification of that.

Q. What should be the definition of professional licensing? What should be the role of inservice councils in professional licensing?

R. (Dr. Moore) I made assumptions that "if" the 24 hours of inservice was to satisfy the conditions of professional licensing, then the contingency conditions set up by the inservice councils are inappropriate now. What I'm trying to point out is, that that may not be its primary purpose, in terms of the inservice council, I said that only under those conditions it produces inappropriate behavior. If the appropriate behavior is for people to take more courses, and its not related to professional licensing, then

it's highly appropriate. I've tried to point out that a college or university is likely to be an inappropriate contingency condition to satisfy the needs of an individual school district. We could debate a variety of things, but whatever definition we could agree on, I would want to examine the appropriateness of what I call the contingency conditions, and I only selected two.

Q. Is inservice education for the school district or for the individual teacher?

R. (Dr. Moore) Again, I tried to avoid inservice. If the profession, in its wisdom, says that we need to have, not only a standard definition of licensing, but also, in order to remain in the profession, a continuation of taking courses which makes the person most valuable to a local district, then I would say that the contingency condition of an in-service council would be more appropriate than a university in designing and carrying out the function of course preparation and monitoring for the local district. Conversely, because of the lack of conflict of interest potential, the university would be more appropriate for preparing people with a common set of competencies that are peculiar to the needs of an individual district.

Q. Who should decide standards for teacher education? Should the Secretary of Education or the State Board of

Education set the standards for teacher education?

R. (Dr. Moore) We need to examine what the Secretary of Education does as a subsystem, what his department does, what the college or university does, what the school district does, and what PSEA does. What they are now doing does not necessarily make it right, rather we must raise the question as to the appropriate outcomes, and are the contingency conditions such that the desired outcomes are likely to occur. My point is that we have not raised that question. You have dealt with the legislature, but have you dealt with the local school districts, have you dealt with the teacher education program, or in turn, has the teacher education program dealt with the PSEA? In a non-political sense, what are the appropriate outcomes, what should each subsystem be doing, and then do we have the conditions for what we should be doing, one subsystem interacting with the others?

Q. Once I penetrated the semantics of the systems talk, I noted a very valuable form of logic, that is, you are using a model logic in talking about a network of contingency systems. The question I'd like to ask is, if all of these systems are contingency, what system is necessary?

R. (Dr. Moore) I think that we've got two kinds of systems that are always in operation. Those over which we have no control initially, they are spontaneous or politically

expedient, and those which we purposefully design, such as inservice councils and program approval to try to deal with a particular question. What I think would be particularly productive for us as a total system is, if we could bring before society the recognition that, as we develop more complex systems, it is increasingly important to develop a monitoring procedure that examines the complexity of our system. We do this in trying to go to the moon, engineers and psychologists are doing this in looking at noise pollution, and the whole problem of ecology. We've got to create an awareness of how the complexities of the educational systems interact and affect each other so that we are not bogged down with superficial instances rather than the thing that produced the instances. We must try to create a public awareness of what is happening.

Q. The necessary system then, is for the public will to manifest itself concerning education and that all the other systems are contingent?

R. (Dr. Moore) Yes! Ultimately you could say that, I would agree.

Q. Is the purpose of the system to develop predictable behaviors, to make predictions?

R. (Dr. Moore) Yes, to make predictions. I would predict, in terms of the inservice issue, that if we wanted the

kinds of competencies I eluded to in terms of teachers the inservice subsystem will not produce this, it is predictable that it will not. On the other hand, I think it is predictable that, if we have an appointed set of non-professionals to dictate the standards of education, there would be certain consequences. I think certain predictions can be made and I'm simply saying that we need to look at these.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING THE
ISSUES EXPLORED BY THE FORUM

Dr. Southworth: I'd like to suggest that we continue the discussion, and other of us get into the analysis of the inter-action between the subsystems over the next few months; we need to continue this forum to put before the profession and society and all aspects of the total system this discourse and continue to refine it. We've lived through an era of having to accommodate more students, but are now entering another kind of era, and building on Bill's point we've had to sell and convince colleagues in our particular context, that we have to get involved in this whole area and try to put something out there as an alternative. An alternative that the professional could involve himself in that would be different than graduate courses on a campus, but be of a challenging and quality nature and of such substance that your credentials and mine would have real value in 1985 or 1990. This is not to demean what's out there right now. What I have seen happen in the last few months is that our graduate faculty and academic policy committee has exacted a higher level of design and delivery and assessment on these experiences than they have on the courses on campus.

Dr. Moore: I'd like to follow Horton's charge and suggest that groups of individuals sit down and examine the office

of the Secretary of Education, and suggest what kinds of things, in terms of expected outcomes, if he is a non-professional, and do the same if he is a professional. I'd like to also suggest that a group examine the State Board of Education and raise the same question as to whether we need a state board, and if so, what outcomes should we expect -- should the members be elected, appointed, professionals, non-professionals? In order to answer such questions we would need to know how it affects lower level systems. The department of education proliferates committees, and although I'm usually included on such committees, should the members be elected if they are to represent the profession? How do we determine whether we should have program approval? Who makes these decisions? We haven't talked about the outcomes, and if we do, should we not talk about procedures which logically produce those outcomes? I suggest that we establish groups of people to examine a list of subsystems which interact in determining the educational outcomes of Pennsylvania's educational system. My list, which could be expanded would include:

1. Office of Secretary of Education.
2. State Board of Education.
3. State Department of Education.
4. State School Board Association.

5. Teacher Training Institutions.

6. Local School Districts.

7. Pennsylvania State Education Association.

Dr. Faulk: I'd like to respond to your remarks, Bill, wherein you say that if you're going to tinker with any part of the system, you must look at the related parts of the systems to make sure that all the systems are working toward a common set of goals. Realistically there are two things that we must keep in mind. First, the system is made up of human beings with different sets of values and goals, and they see themselves protecting different interests. As a result it will be difficult to get all these forces together to work toward a common goal, as evidenced in the Joint Action Committee. For instance, the school board now see themselves as protectorates of education for the Commonwealth, and see others as trying to take advantage of the people, which is very unfortunate. Second, we may never approach such an interacting system because, if you examine similar attempts in other areas, as in the case of ecology where everyone has a dedicated course, once you tinker with one system, you cause problems in another part of the system. Although we do need to look at the total system, and try to keep it in proper balance, the minute we tinker with any part, another part gets out of balance.

Dr. Moore: I suggest that the system is out of balance, and that appropriate tinkering could give the system greater balance.